

Treasury. Every single Secretary of the Treasury, until Janet Yellen, looked like—well, older, certainly, than the Presiding Officer—but looked like we do.

She saw MacNolia Cox's face, and she learned her story as she was looking through these. She told reporters when she was competing, she thought of MacNolia. She thought about what she had endured 85 years earlier.

Now, more Americans are learning both of their stories. More kids are seeing themselves in the faces of champions. That is why Black history matters. It matters in the classroom. It matters in movies. It matters on the Senate floor. It matters in books. It matters in TV shows. It matters in the national news. It is how we shine a light on the injustices students like MacNolia and Zaila had to overcome and work to fight them.

It is how we show kids that these are dreams—these aren't dreams only for certain kids who look a certain way. These dreams, these aspirations, these achievements in 21st century America should be for everyone.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Akron's MacNolia Cox, and even more importantly, telling her story for future generations.

CHILD TAX CREDIT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, over the past week, we have put money directly—directly—in the pockets of the families of 60 million American children.

In Ohio, 2.1 million children, their families got hundreds of dollars each in tax cuts, money to help them keep up with the costs of raising a family, money they will spend in the local economy—I say to the Presiding Officer, you know this, the largest tax cut for working families in American history ever.

Stories have poured into our office from across Ohio—the Presiding Officer is hearing those in Hawaii—all from parents who work hard to make ends meet. They now have a little bit extra of their own money back to spend on groceries and childcare and medical bills and school supplies.

We care about families. There is a lot of talk in this body about we care about families. Well, if you care about families, this is all about empowering families. Families decide how to spend these dollars; MITCH MCCONNELL doesn't decide. Joe Biden doesn't decide. BRIAN SCHATZ doesn't decide. I don't decide how we spend these dollars. Families decide. They are dollars they have earned working hard to provide for their family—it is hard work raising children—and how they have raised their kids.

I think all of us are hearing these stories. Some of them on our websites, some of us in townhalls, we are hearing these stories. Let me just briefly tell just a handful of them.

Rob, from Copley, OH, said he is going to spend it on “bills and neces-

sities, especially necessities for [my] kids.”

Traci said she is going to use it to “pay for my children's sports fees.”

One mother said, “My 8-year-old was able to attend a Coding Camp this week” for the first time. She was just thrilled.

We know how expensive healthcare is. We know how medical bills and copays and premiums eat away at families' budgets. So many parents have talked about how this will help them afford healthcare expenses.

Leanne, from Akron, is going to be able to afford “my daughter's medical bills.”

Hayley said she will use the tax cut “to pay for speech therapy for [her] child.”

Susan said it will allow her to “pay for my child's dyslexia tutoring.”

Jen said, “Ours will be going straight”—you have to love this one—“Ours will be going straight to the orthodontist each month.”

Brittney wrote that this tax cut “came at a great time.” She said:

My son got sick with pneumonia this . . . week. That led to an urgent care visit, breathing treatment, chest X-rays, and a lot of medicine—so our payment will go to [emergency] medical bills to make sure our son [can thrive] and has the medicine he needs.

The Presiding Officer may remember that there were two votes on the child tax credit. First, an amendment to take it out—every Republican voted to take it out—and then an amendment to pass the bill on March 6 at about this time of day and every Republican voted against it. I know it is all about tax cuts for rich people for them, but we can get to that later.

We know another benefit of this is, this is money spent in communities. I am not getting any notes from parents saying: “You know, thank you, Senator BROWN, for this child tax credit you have been working on for a decade. I am going to put more money in my Swiss bank account.” Nobody is saying that. We have gotten so many stories already how this money supports the economy and supports jobs.

Katie from Brecksville: Month 1, she is using it for “a much-needed family vacation.” Month 2, she is using it for “school supplies.” That supports hotel jobs and restaurants jobs and retail jobs.

Lyndsay said she had used it for “back to school clothes,” again, supporting local retailers.

Brittany from Butler said: “We will be able to put new windows in the kids' bedrooms that will keep them cooler in the summer and warmer in the winter.” That sounds like work for a local handyman or a woman or a window business.

Lisa said she is spending it on “diapers and school supplies . . . we put a little into starting a 529 college fund.”

Think about that. These families are struggling. I don't know for sure, but sounds like Lisa may have a couple of

children, so she gets this—they are little, so she is going to get \$300 per child. So she gets \$600 July 15. She will get \$600 August 15. She will get \$600 September 15. She will get \$600 October 15 and November 15. And she has decided she can now afford a few things she couldn't afford. But she is going to maybe put \$100 of that every month into a 529 college fund so her child will be—the whole idea of infrastructure is building a base, a foundation, to launch children into better lifestyles, to launch children into a more productive life, to give kids opportunity. That is what this does. That is what the child tax credit does. And it is almost every-body.

Ninety-two percent of Ohio kids' families are getting a tax cut every single month. So many parents mention the costs of childcare. So often, over and over, we hear how this will allow parents to afford the childcare that allows them to go to work.

Courtney, a mother, wrote that her tax cut is already more than half—“slightly more than half the cost of part-time daycare tuition per month here in Athens,” down in southeast Ohio. She said, it is appreciated so much, the “help getting my child back into childcare and keeping me and my husband in the workforce.”

So it comes back to one question—I think the Presiding Officer knows this—whose side are you on? Whose side are you on in these fights? Are you on the side of the parents who work hard every day for their families?

In a dignity-of-work roundtable in our Senate Banking Committee, a woman from West Virginia said the words “working” and “poor” shouldn't be in the same sentence. The words “working” and “poor” shouldn't be in the same sentence. These are families who are working really hard. Give them a little bit of a break so they can rise above the poverty line so they can afford some things to launch their children into more productive lives.

So are you on the side of these parents who work every day? Or are my colleagues going to raise these families' taxes at the end of the year? Because this expires next year, if we don't continue it. I haven't seen any help yet on their side wanting to come in. I am still hopeful.

We remember what happened on 2017. The Presiding Officer remembers this. In 2017, you could walk out this door pretty much any time of day, and you could look down the hall in 2017, and you could see lobbyists lined up outside of MITCH MCCONNELL's office, all well dressed, all really, really well paid, all hat in hand—some literally, some figuratively—saying: Senator MCCONNELL, we need this additional tax break.

Do you know what? We spend \$1.5 trillion on that tax cut. They don't want to spend \$100 billion a year on these children. One hundred billion is—I should do the math really quick—about 8 percent of \$1.5 trillion, something like that—6 percent. So they will

do \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts. Seventy percent of it went to the richest people in the country. Yet they don't want to do tax cuts for children that elicit these stories.

I don't recall, getting on my website, stories saying: You know, thank you, Senator BROWN—even though I voted against it—thank you for that big tax cut back in 2017. I could buy another yacht, thank you. Or I get to go to Europe again, thank you.

We don't hear those stories. Here are the stories you hear about these children who need that tax cut.

So you will remember when they all lined up outside of our colleague Senator McConnell's office. You will remember that tax cut. They promised it would trickle down to everyone else and then it would create all this prosperity. Well, we know it didn't happen. They kept the money for themselves—no shock there. Corporations turned around and spent that money on—shocking—stock buybacks for their executives. They ended up, always, in the pockets of their executives.

Now, this year, without a single vote from Republicans in Congress, who passed tax cuts for everyone else, a pretty simple contrast: tax cuts for billionaires and corporations—thank you very much—as they line up down the hall, or do you want tax cuts for working families?

Every single month, we show parents and workers, every single month these checks are coming: \$300 per child if your child is from newborn to 5, \$250 a month if your child is from 6 to 17. Every single month, we show we are on your side. We are putting more of your own money back into your pockets.

I know the Presiding Officer joins in this. We will not stop fighting to make sure parents' hard work pays off. We will not stop. We will deliver on this.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

RENEWABLE FUEL STANDARD

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, many bills get introduced in the Senate and don't seem to go anywhere. The reason is that they are meant to be simply messaging documents, making a statement, telling people what you believe, not necessarily with the motive of passing a piece of legislation.

Now, I usually do not care to comment on these bills. It is simply not worth the time. But when I see the combination of false information spread in messaging bills that could negatively impact my State, I must set the record straight, and that is why I am here.

Several colleagues just introduced a bill to repeal the renewable fuel standard. I have been a proud advocate for renewable energy. Iowa is the leader in both wind and renewable fuels. When it comes to the renewable fuel standard, it is hard to argue that there has ever been a more successful clean-fuel policy implemented across the world. Between 2008 and 2020, the use of biofuels under the renewable fuel standard resulted in a savings of 980 million metric tons of carbon dioxide. That is the equivalent of removing over 200 million cars from the road for 1 year. The renewable fuel standard makes gasoline more affordable. It generates good-paying jobs. It reduces oil imports and reduces our country's greenhouse gas emissions.

The messaging coming from the bill rehashes the same talking points about ethanol that Big Oil has trotted out for the past decades. So, once again, Big Oil raises its ugly head.

Of course, Big Oil's talking points have been completely debunked by the latest science and even our nonpartisan research from the Congressional Budget Office. And Congress depends a great deal upon the research done by the Congressional Budget Office, a nonpartisan group of professional people that study things a long time before they release their information.

Now, my pro-oil colleagues say that the renewable fuel standard causes food and feed prices to rise. However, in 2014, the CBO looked at this issue and the impact on food prices if the renewable fuel standard was fully repealed. The Congressional Budget Office concluded that American food prices would be just one-quarter of 1 percent higher if the renewable fuel standard was kept in place versus a total repeal. Out of a \$100 grocery bill, the impact is no more than a quarter. But when you consider that there is a savings of \$5 every time you fill up your gas tank due to the renewable fuel standard, consumers save money overall with the renewable fuel standard in place.

My colleagues who introduced this messaging legislation also claimed, falsely, that corn ethanol achieves little to no reduction in greenhouse gases. Now, this must be the most ridiculous assertion made against ethanol. I would like to invite my colleagues to visit Iowa to see how far ethanol has come in reducing emissions.

The most recent research from Harvard shows that corn ethanol greenhouse gas emissions are 46 percent lower than gasoline. Research by the U.S. Department of Agriculture found the reduction in CO₂ could reach 71 percent by next year if farmers follow best practices.

At a time when the Nation is working to reduce fossil fuel consumption and protect our environment, why would my colleagues introduce a bill that would increase our dependence upon foreign oil and, at the same time, increase greenhouse gas emissions?

And some of these people on this bill have the most pure environmental record in the U.S. Senate.

Renewable fuels like ethanol have a 40-year track record of making fuel more affordable and vehicles more efficient. To limit this consumer choice at the pump is completely irresponsible. Attempts to limit consumer choice, which are driven by big oil interests, must be defeated.

The United States should continue to build on the progress of the renewable fuel standard and bring policy to the table that reduces greenhouse gas emissions and brings jobs to rural America.

Let me end with a history of the RFS because this legislation is a story of irony if you consider how we got to the renewable fuel standard in the first place. You see, Big Oil wanted it. Why did they want it? Well, a lot of States where they had smog had what we call the oxygenate requirement. It was required in the Clean Air Acts that Congress has passed over the decades. In order to meet that standard, Big Oil would add what they call MTBE, a product made out of petroleum that they added to their gasoline to meet the oxygenate standards, to reduce smog.

After a long period of time, people realized that the MTBE was poisoning groundwater in California—maybe other places as well, but I remember mostly the conflict being in California—and they were being sued. So by 2005, Big Oil decided they didn't want to be sued, and what could they do to get out of it? Well, the RFS was the answer.

I was chairman of the Finance Committee at the time. They came to us with the ideas of the RFS, and it fit into a lot of things that we from agricultural interests were trying to accomplish as well. So the renewable fuel standard was written in cooperation with Big Oil—the first time in three decades that Big Oil had any interest in working with ethanol industry. Then, what, after 3 or 4 years of working with us, they have been attacking the RFS since then.

This piece of legislation I am speaking about today is just one more example of Big Oil trying to attack ethanol. And I gave all the facts about ethanol being good for the consumer, good for the environment, and good for less reliance on foreign countries for our energy sources. In fact, everything about ethanol is good, good, good.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.